

REMARKS

Claims 1-102 are pending in this application, with claims 1, 27, 52, and 78 being independent. Claims 1, 7, 8, 9, 11, 13, 18-27, 43-48, 52, and 78 have been amended. Claims 2-4, 16, 53-55, and 67 have been cancelled. New claim 103 has been added. No new matter has been added. Support for the new claim can be found at least at pages 17-19 of the specification.

35 U.S.C. § 102(e) Rejections

Claims 1-2, 4-28, 30-53, 55-79, and 81-102 have been rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 102(e) as being anticipated by US Patent Number 6,799,326 (Boylan). Applicants respectfully request reconsideration and withdrawal of the rejections based on the amendments to the claims and the following arguments. Claim 1 as amended contains features that are neither disclosed, nor suggested by the art of record. Claim 1 recites:

A computer-implemented method for blocking advertisements, the method comprising:

- a) accepting user input indicating at least one category of ads to be blocked;
- b) accepting user input requesting content that includes at least one ad, an ad being associated with at least one category; and
- c) preventing an ad from being served if at least a predetermined number of its associated categories match a category of ads to be blocked, wherein the categories associated with the ad are determined from the content of a document linked to by the ad.

Applicants respectfully submit that Boylan fails to teach or suggest **preventing an ad from being served if at least a predetermined number of its associated categories match a category of ads to be blocked, where the categories associated with the ad are determined from content of a document linked to by the ad**. Boylan discloses a program guide for interactive television in which local advertisements are distributed to the interactive program guides implemented on user television equipment (Boylan, Abstract). The local advertisements may be displayed when a user selects a related global advertisement (*Id.*). Advertisements may be blocked based on content, however such blocking is based on a tag associated with a respective ad.

More specifically, the relied upon portions of Boylan describe that advertisements may include tags that can be used to block advertisements based on the content of the advertisements as identified by the tags (Boylan, column 11, lines 20-32). Applicants respectfully submit that there is no mention whatsoever in the cited portion of Boylan of a document linked to by ad, or determining the category of an ad based on a document linked to by an ad. The cited portion of Boylan only describes determining the category of an ad based on an attached tag.

Moreover, there is no mention of a document linked to by ad, or determining the category of an ad based on a document anywhere in Boylan. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 1.

Independent claim 52, recites **means for preventing an ad from being served if at least a predetermined number of its at least one category match any of the at least one category of ads to be blocked, wherein the at least one category associated with the ad is determined from content of a document linked to by the ad.** Applicants respectfully submit that Boylan fails to disclose or suggest such a feature. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 52.

Claims 5-15, 17-26, 56-67, and 68-77 are all variously dependent on independent claims 1 and 52, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given above for claims 1 and 52. Claims 2, 4, 16, 53, 55 and 67 were cancelled, thus rendering the rejection of those claims moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow claims 5-15, 17-26, 56-66, and 68-77.

Independent claim 27 as amended contains features that are neither disclosed nor suggested by the art of record. For example, claim 27 recites:

A computer-implemented method for determining a set of advertisements,
the method comprising:

- a) accepting at least one category of ads to be blocked;
- b) adjusting a weight of the categories in a comparison function;
- c) accepting at least one ad, the ad being associated with at least one category;
- d) accepting a document being associated with at least one category; and
- e) comparing the ad with the document using the comparison function.

Applicants respectfully submit that Boylan fails to disclose or suggest **adjusting a weight of the categories in a comparison function**. In the rejection to claim 27, the Examiner stated that Boylan disclosed such a feature at column 12, lines 4-15. Applicants respectfully disagree. The cited portion of Boylan merely describes that a filtering criteria is selected (Boylan, col. 12, ll. 4-6). Examples of the criteria given include blocking all adult programming advertisements and allowing only advertisements for electronic equipment (Boylan, col. 12, ll. 6-15). However, there is no mention of adjusting a weight of a category, or a comparison function. Boylan discloses filtering advertisements using a filtering criteria, but does not describe the filtering criteria being based on weights of each category or a comparison function anywhere in the relied upon portions of the reference.

Because Boylan fails to disclose each and every feature of claim 27, it cannot possibly anticipate it. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 27.

Independent claim 78 includes the feature of **means for adjusting a weight of each of the at least one category in a comparison function**. Applicants respectfully submit that Boylan fails to disclose or suggest such a feature. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claim 78.

Claims 28, 30-52, 79, and 81-102 are all variously dependent on independent claims 27 and 78, and are therefore allowable for at least the reasons given above for the independent claims. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejection and allow claims 28, 30-52, 79, and 81-102.

35 U.S.C. § 103(a) Rejections

Claim 3, 29, 54, and 80 are rejected under 35 U.S.C. § 103(a) as being unpatentable over Boylan in view of Bangalore ("Exploiting a Probabilistic Hierarchical Model for Generation"). Applicants respectfully disagree. Claims 29 and 80 are variously dependent on claims 27 and 78 and are therefore allowable with respect to

Applicant : Brian Axe et al.
Serial No. : 10/656,917
Filed : September 5, 2003
Page : 18 of 18

Attorney's Docket No.: 16113-0768001 / GP-143-00-US

Boylan for at least the reasons given for claims 27 and 78. Bangalore fails to cure the deficiencies of Boylan. Claims 3 and 54 were cancelled, thus rendering the rejections moot. Applicants therefore respectfully request that the Examiner withdraw the rejections and allow claims 29 and 80.

Conclusion


It is believed that all of the pending issues have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reasons for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this reply should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this reply, and the amendment of any claim does not necessarily signify concession of unpatentability of the claim prior to its amendment. Applicant submits that all claims are in condition for allowance.

Please apply the required charge for the added independent claim fee and any other charges or credits to deposit account 06-1050 referencing Attorney Docket No.16113-0768001/GP-143-00-US.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: 8/19/2008

Fish & Richardson P.C.
P.O. Box 1022
Minneapolis, MN 55440-1022
Telephone: (202) 783-5070
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945



Michael W. Tieff
Reg. No. 57,845